

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

ROY A. O'GUINN.

Plaintiff,

v.

LISA WALSH, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-CV-00273-CLB

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME AND STRIKING
DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS**

[ECF Nos. 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72]

This case involves a civil rights action filed by Plaintiff Roy O’Guinn (“O’Guinn”) against Defendants Charles Daniels (“Daniels”), Michael Minev (“Minev”), Martin Naughton (“Naughton”), and Debbie Keenon (“Keenon”) (collectively referred to as “Defendants”). (ECF No. 12.) O’Guinn filed a second amended complaint on October 5, 2020. (ECF No. 12.) Upon screening, the Court found that O’Guinn stated “colorable claim for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs regarding his pelvic girdle.” (ECF No. 17 at 6.) O’Guinn was permitted to proceed on an Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against Naughton, Walsh and Minev in Claim 1, and the portion of Claim 2 alleging Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference against Keenon. (*Id.* at 11-12.)

20 Defendants answered O'Guinn's complaint on June 21, 2021, and a scheduling
21 order was issued with discovery end date of January 17, 2022. (ECF Nos. 38, 43.) On
22 December 15, 2021, the Court granted an extension of discovery to conclude on March
23 17, 2022. (ECF No. 57.) Thereafter, the Court granted extensions of time to file dispositive
24 motions to June 30, 2022. (ECF Nos. 61, 63.)

O’Guinn has now filed six dispositive motions and seeks another extension of time to July 30, 2022 to file additional dispositive motions. (ECF Nos. 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72.) O’Guinn’s six dispositive motions appear to be largely duplicative and/or address issues outside the scope of his complaint. The issues in this case are limited only to the

1 claims which the Court allowed to proceed on screening, as stated above, up to the date
2 the second amended complaint was filed – October 5, 2020. If O’Guinn wishes to address
3 medical issues that have occurred after that date, he must initiate a new action. The
4 deadline to file an amended complaint expired in this case on October 18, 2021 and will
5 not be extended. (ECF No. 43.)

6 Therefore, the six dispositive motions are hereby **STRICKEN**. (ECF No. 65, 66,
7 67, 69, 71, 72.) O’Guinn shall refile only **one** dispositive motion, also known as a motion
8 for summary judgment, addressing only the claims which were allowed to proceed in this
9 case on screening on or before **JUNE 30, 2022**. O’Quinn is again reminded that although
10 he is proceeding *pro se*, he is required to follow the rules and orders of this Court.
11 Therefore, O’Guinn is advised that if he chooses to file a dispositive motion, or motion for
12 summary judgment, the rules limit such motions to 30 pages, excluding exhibits, and the
13 motion must comply in other ways with the Court’s Local Rules and the General Order
14 related to inmate litigation. See LR 7-3(a); General Order 2021-5 at (3)(a).

15 O’Guinn’s motion for an extension of time to file dispositive motions is **DENIED**.
16 (ECF No. 70.)

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 **DATED:** June 8, 2022.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28